

1 BENJAMIN W. BULL (AZ Bar No. 009940)
 2 TRAVIS C. BARHAM* (AZ Bar No. 024867)
 3 Alliance Defense Fund
 4 15333 N. Pima Road, Suite 165
 5 Scottsdale, Arizona 85260
 6 (480) 444-0020
 (480) 444-0028—facsimile
 bbull@telladf.org
 tbarham@telladf.org

7 DAVID A. FRENCH* (TN Bar No. 16692; KY Bar No. 86986)
 8 Alliance Defense Fund
 9 12 Public Square
 Columbia, Tennessee 38401
 (931) 490-0591
 (931) 490-7989—facsimile
 dfrench@telladf.org

10 DAVID J. HACKER (CA Bar No. 249272; IL Bar No. 6283022)
 11 Alliance Defense Fund
 12 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100
 13 Folsom, California 95630
 (916) 932-2850
 (916) 932-2851—facsimile
 dhacker@telladf.org

14 * *Pro hac vice* admission

15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs College Republicans at San Francisco State University,
 Leigh Wolf and Trent Downes

16
 17
 18
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

19
 20
COLLEGE REPUBLICANS AT SAN
FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, an
 21 unincorporated student organization; **LEIGH**
 22 **WOLF**, an individual; **TRENT DOWNES**,
 23 an individual,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26
 27 **CHARLES B. REED**, individually and in
 his official capacity as Chancellor and ex-
 officio member of the Board of Trustees of

28
Case No. C-07-3542-WDB

Hon. Wayne D. Brazil

**FIRST AMENDED VERIFIED
 COMPLAINT**

1 the California State University; **ROBERT A.**
2 **CORRIGAN**, individually and in his official
3 capacity as President of San Francisco State
4 University; **J. E. SAFFOLD**, individually
5 and in her official capacity as Vice President
6 for Student Affairs at San Francisco State
7 University; **JOEY GREENWELL**,
8 individually and in his official capacity as
9 Director of the Office of Student Programs
10 and Leadership Development at San
11 Francisco State University,
12

13 Defendants.

14 Plaintiffs College Republicans at San Francisco State University, Leigh Wolf, and
15 Trent Downes, by and through counsel, and for their Complaint against Defendants Charles B.
16 Reed, Robert A. Corrigan, J. E. Saffold, and Joey Greenwell, hereby state as follows:

17 INTRODUCTION

18 1. At the heart of one of the most diverse communities in America, one of
19 California's leading public universities systematically prohibits and punishes political and
20 religious speech by students that is outside the campus political mainstream. Students who
21 matriculate San Francisco State University ("SFSU" or "University") are promised a forum for
22 free debate and free exchange of ideas. However, some views are more welcome than others.

23 2. This case arises from efforts by a public university, SFSU, through its officials, to
24 restrict and abridge the expressive rights of its students and student organizations. SFSU, as a
25 public institution of higher learning, is bound by the First Amendment to the United States
Constitution to refrain from infringing on the free speech rights of those it educates. Instead, the
Defendants in this case have engaged in unlawful censorship. Through a series of
unconstitutional policies and practices, they have attempted to suppress constitutionally
protected expression on campus simply because that expression offended the sensitivities of
some.

26 3. When College Republicans at San Francisco State University held an Anti-
27 Terrorism Rally on campus in October 2006, one student filed a frivolous complaint with SFSU
28 officials alleging that the College Republicans had "incited violence," created a "hostile

environment,” and engaged in “acts of incivility.” Although the sole basis for the complaint was that members of the College Republicans had stepped on Hamas and Hezbollah flags in an act of political protest—expression that is clearly constitutionally protected—the complaint launched a five-month “investigation” by Defendants into College Republicans’ free speech activities, which chilled Plaintiffs’ ability to freely express their political, social, cultural and religious ideas on campus.

4. The violation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights is a symptom of a systemic problem in California's public university system. By policy and practice, the California State University ("CSU"), SFSU, and officials thereof are violating the free speech and expression rights of each and every student on campus. CSU, acting through the trustees and the chancellor, Defendant Charles B. Reed, has implemented a system-wide Orwellian speech code that is vague, overbroad, and suppress the discussion of controversial viewpoints by students. SFSU, acting through, Defendants Robert A. Corrigan, J. E. Saffold, and Joey Greenwell, enforces the CSU speech code and has implemented local speech codes that are vague, overbroad, and suppress the discussion of controversial viewpoints by students. These speech codes are enforced, in part, through a system of reporting that encourages students to file complaints about their fellow students and student organizations whenever those students or organizations utter words or engage in actions deemed subjectively "uncivil," "intimidating," or "harassing."

5. To remedy these constitutional violations and to put an end to the ongoing harm Defendants are causing, Plaintiffs College Republicans at San Francisco State University, Leigh Wolf, and Trent Downes seek declaratory and injunctive relief invalidating and prohibiting the enforcement of each of the policies comprising CSU's and SFSU's speech codes, and seek damages for the chilling of their First Amendment rights by the University's investigation of their protected speech and impermissible closure of the "marketplace of ideas."

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This action raises federal questions under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

⁷. This Court has original jurisdiction over these federal claims pursuant to 28

1 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

2 8. This Court has authority to award the requested declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C.
 3 § 2201; the requested injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3); the requested damages under
 4 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3); and attorneys' fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

5 9. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 in the Northern District of California
 6 because a substantial part of the actions or omissions giving rise to this case occurred within this
 7 District, and at least one Defendant resides in this District.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

9 10. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c)-(d) & 3-5, this is a civil rights case, in a non-
 10 excepted category, suitable for assignment to the San Francisco or Oakland divisions because the
 11 civil action arose in San Francisco County.

PLAINTIFFS

13 11. Plaintiff College Republicans at San Francisco State University is an
 14 unincorporated, expressive student organization at San Francisco State University. It is a local
 15 chapter of a national organization known as the College Republican National Committee, an
 16 independent, section 527 political organization, and is a chartered member of the California
 17 College Republicans. Neither the College Republican National Committee nor the California
 18 College Republicans are parties to this lawsuit.

19 12. Plaintiff Leigh Wolf is, and was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a student
 20 at San Francisco State University and an officer of College Republicans at San Francisco State
 21 University, an expressive student organization.

22 13. Plaintiff Trent Downes is, and was at all times relevant to this Complaint, a
 23 student at San Francisco State University and an officer of College Republicans at San Francisco
 24 State University, an expressive student organization. Mr. Downes has sincerely held religious
 25 beliefs based on his Episcopalian faith that he desires to express on campus.

DEFENDANTS

27 14. Defendant Charles B. Reed is, and was at all times relevant to this Complaint,
 28 Chancellor and member of the Board of Trustees of the California State University. Defendant

1 Reed's duties include the adoption of rules and regulations pursuant to Cal. Educ. Code § 89030
2 that govern the California State University, including San Francisco State University. He is sued
3 in his official and individual capacities.

4 15. Defendant Robert A. Corrigan is, and was at all times relevant to this Complaint,
5 President of San Francisco State University. President Corrigan's duties include the oversight of
6 San Francisco State University and the execution of policies and regulations that govern the
7 University. He is sued in his official and individual capacities.

8 16. Defendant J. E. Saffold is, and was at all times relevant to this Complaint, Vice
9 President of Student Affairs at San Francisco State University. Vice President Saffold's duties
10 include overseeing campus administration, including the policies and procedures contained
11 herein. She is sued in her official and individual capacities.

12 17. Defendant Joey Greenwell is, and was at all times relevant to this Complaint,
13 Director of the Office of Student Programs & Leadership Development at San Francisco State
14 University. Mr. Greenwell's duties include the oversight of student organizations and the
15 application of University policies and regulations to those student organizations. Mr. Greenwell
16 is sued in his individual and official capacities.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. CSU's and SFSU's Speech Codes

18. Student life for undergraduate students at SFSU is governed in part by three
primary documents, the Student Conduct Code (“Student Code”), the Sexual Harassment Policy
and Procedures (“Sexual Harassment Policy”), and the Office of Student Programs and
Leadership Development (“OSPLD”) Student Organization Handbook. These documents
contain comprehensive student conduct guidelines that regulate the bounds of permissible speech
and expression on campus and regulate the conduct of expressive student organizations. These
guidelines will be referred to throughout this Complaint as SFSU’s “speech codes.”

26 19. OSPLD is one of several departments within the Division of Student Affairs at
27 SFSU. Defendant Greenwell is the current Director of OSPLD.

1 20. OSPLD publishes a Student Organization Handbook. This document states that
2 OSPLD “registers all recognized SF State student organizations” and “trains student leaders and
3 advises students regarding event planning [and] University policy...” A copy of Defendants’
4 Student Organization Handbook is attached as Exhibit A to this Complaint.

5 21. The Student Organization Handbook requires student organizations to “abide by
6 all University policies, and local, state and federal laws,” including those cited herein.

7 22. The Student Organization Handbook contains a section entitled “Student Group
8 Misconduct,” which permits student organizations to be held collectively accountable “when the
9 behavior is inconsistent with SF State *goals, principles* and policies.” (*See Ex. A*) (emphasis
10 added). SFSU’s “goals” and “principles” are not defined.

11 23. SFSU’s Student Code republishes California Code of Regulations, Title 5, section
12 41301. California Education Code, title 3, section 89030 gives the CSU trustees, including
13 Defendant Reed herein, the authority to adopt regulations governing CSU campuses. The CSU
14 trustees promulgated California Code of Regulations, Title 5, section 41301. Defendant Reed is
15 charged with implementing the CSU trustees’ policies, including Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301.
16 A copy of Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301 is attached as Exhibit B to this Complaint.

17 24. The Student Code is enforced at SFSU by Defendants Corrigan, Saffold and
18 Greenwell, and requires students to abide by certain “responsibilities.” One “responsibility” of
19 students is that they “*be civil* to one another and to others in the campus community...” Cal.
20 Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301 (2007) (emphasis added). A copy of the relevant portions of
21 Defendants’ 2006-07 *SFSU Bulletin*, which contains the Student Code, is attached as Exhibit C
22 to this Complaint.

23 25. The Student Code also contains a list of “Unacceptable Student Behaviors” that
24 are “subject to disciplinary sanctions,” including: “... (7) Conduct that threatens or endangers
25 the health or safety of any person within or related to the University community, including
26 physical abuse, threats, *intimidation, harassment*, or sexual misconduct.” (*See Ex. C*) (emphasis
27 added). The Student Code does not define “intimidation” or “harassment.”

1 26. On information and belief, Defendants' Sexual Harassment Policy was
2 promulgated by Defendant Corrigan through University Executive Order #95-18. The Sexual
3 Harassment Policy permits the University to "expel students for sexual harassment." A copy of
4 Defendants' Sexual Harassment Policy, University Executive Order #95-18, is contained in the
5 2006-07 *SFSU Bulletin*, previously attached as Exhibit C to this Complaint.

6 27. The Sexual Harassment Policy contains a definition of sexual harassment that
7 gives the University the power to punish any offensive behavior on campus that "emphasizes
8 another person's sexuality." It defines sexual harassment, in relevant part, as conduct which has
9 "the *purpose or effect* of hindering performance by creating or allowing sexually intimidating,
10 hostile, or offensive behavior to occur in the university or in the university-related setting." (See
11 Ex. C) (emphasis added).

12 28. Students and student organizations at SFSU are subject to discipline for violating
13 the Student Code, the Student Organization Handbook, or any other University policy, including
14 the Sexual Harassment Policy.

15 29. Defendant Greenwell and OSPLD can refer complaints of student organization
16 misconduct to SFSU's Student Organization Hearing Panel ("SOHP"), which can "investigate
17 and review allegations of violations of University policy, practices and law by student
18 organizations." (See Ex. A.)

19 30. OSPLD maintains a "Student Group Misconduct" policy, which contains
20 "procedures for filing complaints of alleged violation of University Policies & Complaint
21 Disposition." A copy of Defendants' Student Group Misconduct policy is attached as Exhibit D
22 to this Complaint.

23 31. The Student Group Misconduct policy contains two methods of resolving a
24 complaint, informal resolution and formal disciplinary proceedings. The Student Group
25 Misconduct policy contains the following statement:

26 Informal Resolution of Charges (Optional)—*At the discretion of the Director of*
27 *OSPLD*, a meeting may be convened with representatives of the organization
28 charged and the complaining party, to reach an informal resolution to be agreed
upon by both parties. The meeting will occur within three (3) working days of the
date of the notification of charges letter. If the representatives of the student

1 organization charged and the complaining party reach a mutually acceptable
 2 agreement, the matter shall be closed. If no agreement is reached within five (5)
 3 working days of the notification of charges letter, the matter will proceed to
 SOHP for review and determination.

4 Formal Disciplinary Proceedings—All allegations of misconduct against a
 5 recognized student organization, when not resolved with an informal resolution as
 6 stated above shall be subject to formal review by SOHP.

7 (See Ex. D) (emphasis added). The Director of OSPLD, Defendant Greenwell, chooses whether
 8 to resolve the complaint formally or informally.

9 32. When a formal disciplinary proceeding is chosen, OSPLD refers the matter to
 10 SOHP. The Student Group Misconduct policy describes SOHP in the following statement:

11 Student Organization Hearing Panel (SOHP)—The Student Organization Hearing
 12 Panel is comprised of campus students, faculty and staff for the purpose of
 hearing student organization violations and determining sanctions.

13 Composition of Panel—The panel shall consist of five (5) voting members: two
 14 (2) students (ASI appointments), one (1) staff member (Vice President for Student
 Affairs appointment), and two (2) faculty members (Academic Senate
 15 appointments). The SOHP members serve a one-year term and the Director of the
 OSPLD convenes the Panel. The Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
 16 appoints the Chair of SOHP.

17 (See Ex. D.)

18 33. When SOHP finds a student organization violated a University policy or local,
 19 state or federal law, it may impose punishment on the student organization or its members or
 20 both. Possible punishment includes a letter of warning, censure, probation, suspension, and
 21 revocation of recognition.

B. SFSU's Discriminatory Treatment of Plaintiffs.

22 34. Plaintiff College Republicans at San Francisco State University ("College
 23 Republicans") was founded in 2003. It serves as one of the only politically conservative voices
 24 at SFSU and has approximately three hundred (300) members. College Republicans seeks to
 25 foster, publicize and sustain conservatism on campus and in the San Francisco community.
 26

1 35. Plaintiffs Leigh Wolf and Trent Downes are members of College Republicans and
2 consistently engage in conversations and class discussions regarding issues implicated by
3 SFSU's speech codes.

4 36. Plaintiffs fear that the discussion of their social, cultural, political and/or religious
5 views may be sanctionable under applicable CSU and University speech codes.

6 37. Specifically, SFSU and Defendants Corrigan, Saffold and Greenwell enforced
7 University speech codes against Plaintiffs in violation of their First Amendment rights by
8 conducting a five-month investigation into Plaintiffs' protected expression on campus.

9 38. On October 17, 2006, between 12 p.m. and 2 p.m., College Republicans,
10 including Plaintiffs herein, held an Anti-Terrorism Rally (the "Rally") in Malcolm X Plaza on
11 SFSU's campus.

12 39. The purpose of the Rally was three-fold. First, College Republicans wanted to
13 educate members of the campus about terrorism, both domestic and abroad, and its affect on
14 different countries, including the United States. Second, it wanted to memorialize those who
15 have been victims of recent terrorist attacks. Third, it wanted to identify prominent terrorist
16 organizations around the world and trigger a dialogue about how to properly respond to these
17 groups. College Republicans was particularly concerned with two groups, Hamas and
18 Hezbollah, which it perceives as being particularly dangerous terrorist organizations.

19 40. In the context of creating symbolism for the Rally, members of College
20 Republicans painted butcher paper to resemble the flags of Hamas and Hezbollah. Plaintiffs did
21 not know what the markings on the Hamas and Hezbollah flags meant and could not read the
22 Arabic script on the flags.

23 41. At the Rally on October 17, Plaintiffs placed the Hamas and Hezbollah flags on
24 the ground and stepped on them. This was intentionally done to mimic the way in which these
25 organizations have protested the United States. Unbeknownst to any member of College
26 Republicans, both flags contain Arabic script representing the word "Allah."

27 42. A large group of students gathered in Malcolm X Plaza to watch the Rally. Some
28 of these students expressed anger to the members of College Republicans that the flags contained

1 the word “Allah.” Several of these students discussed with College Republicans how to resolve
2 the matter. College Republicans did not intend to offend anyone of Islamic belief. Accordingly,
3 College Republicans provided the concerned students with markers, and agreed to let them mark
4 over the word “Allah” so that it was no longer visible.

5 43. On information and belief, some students threatened to attack the members of
6 College Republicans if they did not stop stepping on the flags.

7 44. On information and belief, one student, Farhad Rahimi, was not satisfied by the
8 alterations, and claimed he could still see the word “Allah” on the Hamas flag. Mr. Rahimi
9 became visibly angry, and admitted that he was going to do “what I have to do to stop them
10 [College Republicans] from disrespecting.” Mr. Rahimi then threatened to attack Plaintiffs if
11 they continued to step on the flag, and climbed on stage to prevent anyone else from stepping on
12 the flag. A member of College Republicans asked Mr. Rahimi what they could do to keep the
13 situation peaceful. Mr. Rahimi asked that the Hamas flag be removed.

14 45. SFSU police officers and administrators were approximately twenty to thirty (20-
15 30) feet away from this incident and took no action when the students threatened the Plaintiffs.

16 46. Because SFSU police and administrators did nothing to protect Plaintiffs and their
17 free speech rights, College Republicans agreed to remove the Hamas flag from the Rally and
18 rolled it up and gave it to Mr. Rahimi, who then left the stage.

19 47. College Republicans concluded the Rally without further incident.

20 48. On or about October 26, 2006, Brian Gallagher, an SFSU student, filed a formal
21 complaint about the Rally with OSPLD. Mr. Gallagher alleged that “the College Republicans
22 publicly and very evidently walked over and trekked over a banner with Arabic script. That
23 Arabic script represented the word ‘Allah,’ otherwise known as the name of God in Arabic.”
24 This act, the letter claims, was a “route of intolerance and stupidity.” Mr. Gallagher, citing Cal.
25 Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301(a), alleged that College Republicans had “incited violence,” created a
26 “hostile environment,” and engaged in “actions of incivility.” A copy of Mr. Gallagher’s letter is
27 attached as Exhibit E to this Complaint.

28

1 49. On information and belief, after submitting his complaint, Mr. Gallagher solicited
2 letters from other students explaining why they found the act of stepping on the flags “offensive”
3 and “disrespectful.” These letters and e-mails were submitted to OSPLD for review with Mr.
4 Gallagher’s complaint. Copies of the letters and e-mails submitted with Mr. Gallagher’s
5 complaint are attached as Exhibit F to this Complaint.

6 50. Several weeks after Mr. Gallagher filed his complaint, Defendant Greenwell,
7 Director of OSPLD, notified the College Republicans that a complaint had been filed and that
8 OSPLD was conducting a preliminary investigation. Thinking the issue could be resolved
9 quickly, members of College Republicans agreed to give statements to OSPLD as a part of the
10 investigation.

11 51. On information and belief, no other student organization has been “investigated”
12 by SFSU officials for engaging in constitutionally protected expression.

13 52. Pursuant to the OSPLD Student Group Misconduct policy (Ex. D), upon
14 completing an investigation, OSPLD can proceed in one of three ways. First, it may issue a
15 letter of warning that future violations of university policies could result in more severe
16 disciplinary action. A letter of warning remains in an organization’s file for a period of one year
17 from the date of the letter. Second, the OSPLD Director may meet with representatives from the
18 charged organization and the complaining party and attempt to reach an informal resolution.
19 Third, the OSPLD may refer the charges to the Student Organization Hearing Panel (SOHP) for
20 a formal investigation.

21 53. While the OSPLD conducted its investigation, SFSU’s student government
22 association, Associated Students, Inc. (“ASI”), unanimously passed a resolution condemning
23 College Republicans and the Rally. The resolution stated, in part, that the “Associated Students,
24 Inc. deems the College Republicans’ actions as contrary to university values and feel they should
25 be held accountable by the university for their actions.” It further stated that “The actions on the
26 part of the College Republicans amount to no more than hateful religious intolerance, and
27 constitutes [sic] an attempt to defy policies outlined and defined by San Francisco State
28 University’s values” and claimed the College Republicans “pre-meditated the stomping of the

1 flags knowing it would offend some people and possibly incite violence.” The resolution also
2 made clear that if OSPLD’s investigation into the Rally resulted in a finding of wrongdoing by
3 College Republicans, ASI would immediately withdraw all of College Republicans’ student
4 activity fee funding. A copy of *The Golden Gate* article, “ASI Passes Resolution Against Flag
5 Stomping” by Jason Shuffler, detailing ASI’s unanimous resolution is attached as Exhibit G to
6 this Complaint.

7 54. On information and belief, at all times relevant herein, Mr. Gallagher was a
8 college representative for ASI.

9 55. On or about December 1, 2006, Defendant Greenwell, Director of OSPLD, sent
10 College Republican Carl Clark an e-mail stating that OSPLD completed its investigation and was
11 referring the matter to SOHP for a formal investigation of the charges. A copy of Defendant
12 Greenwell’s December 1, 2006 e-mail to Carl Clark is attached as Exhibit H to this Complaint.

13 56. As stated in the OSPLD policies outlined above, OSPLD refers a matter to SOHP
14 for a formal investigation and hearing when OSPLD believes the complaint is serious enough.
15 Defendant Greenwell made no effort to meet with Mr. Gallagher and representatives from
16 College Republicans to try to resolve the matter informally.

17 57. On information and belief, other student organizations have not been subject to a
18 SOHP hearing for engaging in constitutionally protected expression.

19 58. The Student Group Misconduct policy provides that ASI nominates two members
20 to sit on SOHP. In this instance, ASI nominated Joicy Serrano and Faith Cushenberry, both of
21 whom voted with ASI to condemn the Rally. These two students, in addition to the three other
22 members of SOHP, were appointed to determine the appropriate sanctions for College
23 Republicans.

24 59. After Defendant Greenwell assigned the matter to SOHP, but before a formal
25 hearing, College Republicans and Messrs. Wolf and Downes met weekly during school to review
26 the charges leveled against them, campus policies, and legal documents, all in preparation of
27 their SOHP defense. They found it difficult to balance school, work and the ongoing
28 investigation.

1 60. Despite these pressures and distractions, College Republicans held a “Corporate
2 America Appreciation Day” on January 31, 2007, in the Malcolm X Plaza of SFSU. During the
3 event, Mr. Wolf presented a hand-made flag of Al Qaeda, which also bore the name “Allah.”
4 Mr. Wolf stepped on the flag in protest of Al Qaeda’s terrorist activities and Defendants’
5 “investigation” of his and College Republicans’ free speech activities on October 17, 2006.

6 61. College Republicans contacted the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education
7 (“FIRE”) and the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California (“ACLU”) for
8 assistance with their defense of the investigation. On January 23, 2007 and March 7, 2007, FIRE
9 wrote Defendant Corrigan (with copies sent to Defendants Saffold and Greenwell) and asked
10 him to terminate OSPLD and SOHP’s investigation of College Republicans’ Rally. FIRE
11 outlined that flag desecration in the context of political protest is clearly protected expressive
12 activity and that any investigation into this activity violated College Republicans’ First
13 Amendment rights. On March 7, 2007, the ACLU also wrote a letter to Defendant Corrigan
14 (with a copy to Defendant Greenwell) outlining that College Republicans had engaged in
15 protected expression. Both of these letters put Defendants Corrigan, Saffold, and Greenwell on
16 notice that their failure to terminate the investigation would result in a violation of College
17 Republicans’ constitutional rights. Copies of the letters sent to Defendant Corrigan by FIRE and
18 the ACLU are attached as Exhibit I to this Complaint.

19 62. Defendants did not terminate the investigation. Instead, SFSU’s spokesperson,
20 Ellen Griffin, told the *San Francisco Chronicle*: “I don’t believe the complaint is about the
21 desecration of the flag. I believe that the complaint is [about] the desecration of Allah.” A Copy
22 of “S.F. State – Hecklers’ paradise,” by Debra J. Saunders is attached as Exhibit J to this
23 Complaint.

24 63. On or about March 9, 2007, SOHP conducted the formal hearing. Mr. Gallagher
25 and members of College Republicans presented testimony to the panel. As the College
26 Republicans presented their testimony, the SOHP members grew increasingly hostile. The
27 SOHP members refused to allow Mr. Wolf to articulate that the Rally was protected expression
28 under United States Supreme Court precedent.

1 64. On March 16, 2007, nearly five (5) months after the Rally, SOHP concluded its
2 investigation of College Republicans, found no violation of the Student Code, and dismissed Mr.
3 Gallagher's complaint.

4 **C. The Effect of SFSU's Unconstitutional Actions and Speech Codes on Plaintiffs.**

5 65. Plaintiffs Wolf and Downes are members of College Republicans, a politically-
6 interested, expressive student organization which holds (and seeks to advance) opinions and
7 beliefs regarding issues of race, gender, politics, religion and sexual orientation that may be
8 objectionable or offensive to other students and sanctionable under applicable University speech
9 codes.

10 66. Defendants' investigation into Plaintiffs' protected activity had a chilling effect
11 on Plaintiffs' rights to freely and openly engage in appropriate discussions of their theories,
12 ideas, and political and/or religious beliefs. By investigating Plaintiffs' Rally when the only
13 alleged "wrongdoing" was the act of stepping on flags in political protest, Defendants violated
14 rights guaranteed to Plaintiffs by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States
15 Constitution. These rights are clearly established by well-known legal authority, and
16 Defendants' violations were knowing, intentional, and without justification.

17 67. Moreover, Defendants' investigation into Plaintiffs' expressive activities
18 adversely affected Plaintiffs' academic, extracurricular and personal lives in multiple ways.

19 68. Defendants' baseless investigation caused College Republicans to rethink and
20 reduce its expressive activities on campus and to question whether engaging in free speech at
21 SFSU is worth the risk of possible punishment.

22 69. College Republicans has a reputation as a non-violent student organization at
23 SFSU. Defendants' investigation of the organization for inciting violence, creating a hostile
24 environment and engaging in "incivility" on campus destroyed this reputation.

25 70. Mr. Wolf spent over two hundred (200) hours during SFSU's spring 2007
26 semester defending College Republicans on campus and preparing for the SOHP hearing. As a
27 result of this constant distraction, Mr. Wolf received some of his worst grades as a SFSU student.
28

1 71. Messrs. Wolf and Downes were harassed by fellow students during Defendants'
2 investigation. Wolf and Downes' reputations on campus have been tarnished due to the fact that
3 the only student organization with which they identify on campus was threatened with removal
4 and punishment.

5 72. Much of the SFSU community presumed College Republicans were guilty as
6 charged during the investigation and Defendants did nothing to correct this presumption and
7 protect the reputations of Wolf and Downes.

8 73. As an Episcopalian and non-violent person, Mr. Downes strives to respect other
9 religious viewpoints; thus, Mr. Gallagher's complaint and Defendants' investigation placed a
10 stigma of intolerance on him which he may never shed so long as he is a student at SFSU. Mr.
11 Downes fears for his safety on campus when he and College Republicans hold future events. He
12 fears that if he tries to exercise his free speech rights in the future, they will be permanently
13 silenced by a university and student body that does not truly believe in free speech for all and
14 equal protection under the law.

15 74. The University's speech codes contained in the Student Code, the Sexual
16 Harassment Policy, and the Student Organization Handbook have a chilling effect on Plaintiffs'
17 rights to freely and openly engage in appropriate discussions of their theories, ideas and political
18 and/or religious beliefs. Plaintiffs have already been subjected to prosecution under the Student
19 Code, and based on the University's reaction to their constitutionally protected expression, they
20 realistically fear that prosecution under the other speech codes may occur at any time.

21 75. By adopting these speech codes, Defendants have violated rights guaranteed to
22 the Plaintiffs—and to all University students—by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the
23 United States Constitution. These rights are clearly established by governing legal authority, and
24 Defendants' violations are knowing, intentional and without justification.

25 76. The speech policies outlined above are vague, overbroad, discriminate on the
26 basis of religious and/or political viewpoint, interfere with the rights of free association, impose
27 unconstitutional conditions on the receipt of state benefits, and constitute an illegal prior restraint
28 on Plaintiffs' rights of free speech and assembly. These speech policies are therefore facially

1 invalid and invalid as-applied under the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment and the Due
 2 Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. So long as these speech
 3 policies remain in effect, the Defendants are causing ongoing and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs
 4 and to every student and student organization at the University.

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Violation of the Plaintiffs Right to Freedom of Expression**
 7 **and Due Process of Law (42 U.S.C. § 1983)—Speech Code**

8 77. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the foregoing allegations in this Complaint.

9 78. By prohibiting “intimidation [and] harassment”; conduct that “has the purpose or
 10 effect of hindering performance by creating or allowing sexually intimidating, hostile, or
 11 offensive behavior to occur”; “behavior [that] is inconsistent with SF State goals, principles and
 12 policies;” and requiring students “to be civil to one another”; among other things, Defendants
 13 have conditioned the permissibility of speech on the subjective emotional experience of the
 14 listener and have enacted regulations that limit and prohibit speech without providing any
 15 objective guidelines by which Plaintiffs can guide their behavior.

16 79. Defendants, acting under color of state law and according to policy and practice,
 17 have enacted regulations (including, but not limited to the Student Code, Sexual Harassment
 18 Policy, and Student Organization Handbook) that are both vague and overbroad and have
 19 therefore deprive Plaintiffs of their clearly established due process rights guaranteed by the
 20 Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and their clearly established rights to
 21 freedom of speech and expression secured by the First Amendment to the United States
 22 Constitution.

23 80. Because of Defendants’ actions, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer,
 24 irreparable injury that cannot be fully compensated by an award of money damages.

25 81. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to declaratory
 26 relief and a preliminary and permanent injunction invalidating and restraining enforcement of the
 27 University’s speech-restrictive Student Code of Conduct (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301),
 28 Sexual Harassment Policy (University Executive Order #95-18), Student Organization

1 Handbook, and other speech-restrictive policies. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages
 2 in an amount to be determined by the Court and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including
 3 their reasonable attorneys' fees.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Violation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment Right**
 6 **to Freedom of Expression (42 U.S.C. § 1983)—Speech Code**

7 82. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the foregoing allegations in this Complaint.

8 83. By prohibiting “intimidation [and] harassment”; conduct that “has the purpose or
 9 effect of hindering performance by creating or allowing sexually intimidating, hostile, or
 10 offensive behavior to occur”; “behavior [that] is inconsistent with SF State goals, principles and
 11 policies”; and requiring students “to be civil to one another”; among other things, Defendants,
 12 acting under color of state law and according to policy and practice, have explicitly and
 13 implicitly discriminated on the basis of viewpoint and deprived Plaintiffs of their clearly
 14 established rights to freedom of speech and expression secured by the First Amendment to the
 15 Constitution of the United States.

16 84. Because of Defendants’ policies and actions, Plaintiffs have suffered, and
 17 continue to suffer, irreparable injury which cannot be fully compensated by an award of money
 18 damages.

19 85. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to declaratory
 20 relief and a preliminary and permanent injunction invalidating and restraining enforcement of the
 21 University’s speech restrictive Student Code of Conduct (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301),
 22 Sexual Harassment Policy (University Executive Order #95-18), Student Organization
 23 Handbook, and other speech-restrictive policies. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages
 24 in an amount to be determined by the Court and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including
 25 their reasonable attorneys’ fees.

26 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **Unconstitutional Conditions (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

28 86. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the foregoing allegations in this Complaint.

1 87. By enacting the speech-restrictive regulations outlined above and by requiring
 2 every member of the University community, individual and organization, to mirror the
 3 University's values by being "civil," among other things, Defendants, acting under color of state
 4 law and according to policy and practice, have placed unconstitutional conditions on the receipt
 5 of state benefits—specifically, the benefit of a higher education at a state-supported University—
 6 and have therefore deprived the Plaintiffs of their clearly established rights to freedom of speech
 7 and expression secured by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

8 88. Because of Defendants' policies and actions, Plaintiffs have suffered, and
 9 continue to suffer, irreparable injury which cannot be fully compensated by an award of money
 10 damages.

11 89. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to declaratory
 12 relief and a preliminary and permanent injunction invalidating and restraining enforcement of the
 13 University's speech restrictive Student Code of Conduct (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, § 41301),
 14 Sexual Harassment Policy (University Executive Order #95-18), Student Organization
 15 Handbook, and other speech-restrictive policies. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages
 16 in an amount to be determined by the Court and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including
 17 their reasonable attorneys' fees.

18 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Violation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment Rights** 20 (42 U.S.C. § 1983)—Chilling Plaintiffs' Free Speech

21 90. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the foregoing allegations in this Complaint.

22 91. By investigating and threatening Plaintiffs with discipline for an act of clearly
 23 constitutionally protected expression, among other things, Defendants, acting under color of state
 24 law and according to policy and practice, have explicitly and implicitly discriminated on the
 25 basis of viewpoint, chilled Plaintiffs' free expression, and deprived Plaintiffs of their clearly
 26 established rights to freedom of speech and expression secured by the First Amendment to the
 27 Constitution of the United States.

92. Because of Defendants' policies and actions, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer, economic injury and irreparable harm. They, therefore, are entitled to an award of monetary damages, including punitive damages, and equitable relief.

93. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that Defendants violated their First Amendment rights. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages in an amount to be determined by the evidence and this Court and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including their reasonable attorneys' fees.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

First Amendment Retaliation (42 U.S.C. § 1983)—Investigating Plaintiffs' Free Speech

94. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the foregoing allegations in this Complaint.

95. By investigating and threatening Plaintiffs with discipline for an act of clearly constitutionally protected expression, among other things, Defendants, acting under color of state law and according to policy and practice, have explicitly and implicitly discriminated on the basis of viewpoint, retaliated against Plaintiffs' because of their free expression, and deprived Plaintiffs of their clearly established rights to freedom of speech and expression secured by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

96. Because of Defendants' policies and actions, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer, economic injury and irreparable harm. They, therefore, are entitled to an award of monetary damages, including punitive damages, and equitable relief.

97. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that Defendants violated their First Amendment rights. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages in an amount to be determined by the evidence and this Court and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including their reasonable attorneys' fees.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Plaintiffs' Fourteenth Amendment Right to Equal Protection of Law (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

98. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the foregoing allegations in this Complaint.

99. By investigating and threatening Plaintiffs with discipline for an act of clearly constitutionally protected expression, and treating Plaintiffs differently from similarly situated students and student organizations because they are conservative and because of their conservative political beliefs, among other things, Defendants, acting under color of state law and according to policy and practice, have engaged in actions that discriminate on the basis of political status and belief and have therefore deprived Plaintiffs of their clearly established equal protection rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

100. Because of Defendants' policies and actions, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer, economic injury and irreparable harm. They, therefore, are entitled to an award of monetary damages, including punitive damages, and equitable relief.

101. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that Defendants violated their Fourteenth Amendment rights. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages in an amount to be determined by the evidence and this Court and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including their reasonable attorneys' fees

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs College Republicans at San Francisco State University, Leigh Wolf and Trent Downes respectfully request that the Court enter judgment against Defendants Reed, Corrigan, Saffold, and Greenwell, and provide Plaintiffs the following relief:

- A. A declaratory judgment stating that Defendants' speech codes are facially and as-applied unconstitutional and violate the Plaintiffs' rights as guaranteed under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
 - B. A preliminary and permanent injunction restraining enforcement of Defendants' unconstitutional speech codes;
 - C. A declaratory judgment that Defendants' investigation of Plaintiffs' protected expression violated their First Amendment rights;
 - D. An order requiring Defendants to expunge from school records all mention of the disciplinary investigation;

- 1 E. Monetary damages for the illegal speech codes in an amount to be determined by the
 2 Court;
- 3 F. Monetary damages in the amount of \$5,000.00 for infringing upon Plaintiffs' exercise
 4 of their First Amendment rights;
- 5 G. Monetary punitive damages (for Defendants' actions in their individual capacities) for
 6 infringing upon Plaintiffs' exercise of their First Amendment rights;
- 7 H. Plaintiffs' reasonable costs and expenses of this action, including attorneys' fees, in
 8 accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and other applicable law;
- 9 I. All other further relief to which Plaintiffs may be entitled.

10
 11 Respectfully submitted this 30th day of August, 2007,

12 /s/David J. Hacker

13 DAVID J. HACKER
 California Bar No. 249272
 Illinois Bar No. 6283022
 Alliance Defense Fund
 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100
 Folsom, California 95630
 (916) 932-2850
 (916) 932-2851—facsimile
 dhacker@telladaf.org

14
 15 DAVID A. FRENCH*
 Tennessee Bar No. 16692
 Kentucky Bar No. 86986
 Alliance Defense Fund
 12 Public Square
 Columbia, Tennessee 38401
 (931) 490-0591
 (931) 490-7989—facsimile
 dfrench@telladaf.org

16 BENJAMIN W. BULL
 Arizona Bar No. 009940
 TRAVIS C. BARHAM*
 Arizona Bar No. 024867
 Alliance Defense Fund
 15333 N. Pima Road, Suite 165
 Scottsdale, Arizona 85260
 (480) 444-0020
 (480) 444-0028—facsimile
 bbull@telladaf.org
 tbarham@telladaf.org

17
 18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

19
 20 **Pro hac vice* admission

1 **FRCP 7.1 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

2 This Corporate Disclosure Statement is filed on behalf of College Republicans at San
3 Francisco State University in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1.

4 College Republicans at San Francisco State University is an unincorporated student
5 organization at San Francisco State University; it has no parent corporation and has not issued,
6 nor will it issue, publicly held stock. Thus, no other corporation holds any stock in College
7 Republicans at San Francisco State University.

8 A supplemental disclosure statement will be filed upon any change in the information
9 provided herein.

10
11 Respectfully submitted this 30th day of August, 2007,

12
13 /s/David J. Hacker
14 DAVID J. HACKER
15 Attorney for Plaintiffs

VERIFICATION OF COMPLAINT

I, Leigh Wolf, a citizen of the United States and resident of the State of California, hereby declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint and the factual allegations therein, and the facts as alleged are true and correct.

Executed this 29 day of August, 2007, at San Francisco, California.


Leigh Wolf
President
College Republicans at San Francisco State University

VERIFICATION OF COMPLAINT

I, Trent Downes, a citizen of the United States and resident of the State of California, hereby declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint and the factual allegations therein, and the facts as alleged are true and correct.

Executed this 1st day of August, 2007, at San Francisco, California.

Trent Downes
Vice President
College Republicans at San Francisco State University